

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATEWIDE ACCESS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #6**

**February 20, 2007**

**9:30 a.m. – 12 noon**

**ADOT Phoenix Maintenance Building – Hilton Room  
2140 W. Hilton, Phoenix, Arizona**

**ATTENDING:**

Grant Buma, Colorado River Indian Tribe/ITCA  
Dale Buskirk, ADOT – TPD  
Ken Davis, FHWA  
Dave Edwards, ADOT – Right-of-Way  
Sam Elters, ADOT – State Engineer  
Chuck Gillick, ADOT – N. Region Traffic  
Michelle Green, ASLD  
John Harper, ADOT – Flagstaff District  
Bob Hazlett, MAG  
Reza Karimvand, ADOT – Baja Region Traffic

Mike Kondelis, ADOT – Kingman District  
Vince Li, ADOT – Predesign  
Mike Manthey, ADOT – Traffic  
Paul Melcher, YMPO – (phone in)  
Bob Miller, ADOT – SPMG  
Burt Neptune, ADOT – Traffic  
Bryan Perry, Attorney General's Office/Transportation  
Andy Smith, Pinal County  
Daniel Williams, ADOT – Tucson District

**ALSO ATTENDING:** Donald Freeman, PAG

Consultants: Rick Ensdruff – URS, Phil Demosthenes – Parametrix, Caraly Foreman – URS, Connie Denk – URS, Mike Connor – HDR, Preston Kessinger – HDR.

**NOT ATTENDING:** Matt Burdick, ADOT – CCP; Arnold Burnham, ADOT – TPD; Cherie Campbell, PAG; Luana Capponi, ASLD; Julie Decker – BLM; Chris Fetzer, NACOG; Sylvia Hanna, ADOT – Permits; Reed Henry, ADOT - Traffic; Donna Jones, ADOT – Permits; Jeff Martin – City of Mesa; Paul O'Brien, ADOT – Predesign; Sally Stewart, ADOT – CCP; Mary Viparina, ADOT – VPM; and Cheyenne Walsh, League of Cities and Towns.

**MEETING NOTES:**

Dale Buskirk called the meeting to order and opened with introductions.

A PowerPoint presentation, which will also be available on the website, was presented and discussed the following:

- Progress Since the Last TAC Meeting
- Access Classification System
  - Arizona State Highway (Draft) Access Management Categories Table
  - Samples of proposed category maps and assignment listings
  - Access Design Elements, including sample calculation tables and charts
  - Other Access Design Elements
  - Chapters
  - Internal Framework
- Indian Community Outreach
- Next Steps

Rick Ensdorff discussed the agenda and provided an update on the progress of completing the classification system and category definitions since the last TAC meeting, explaining that all of the districts have had an opportunity to go through the classification system and provide feedback on their specific regions. Rick Ensdorff then showed the Arizona State Highway Category Map and explained the category map legend. Don Freeman noted that the colors of the urban mixed and urban secondary categories are hard to differentiate. Rick Ensdorff responded that they will work to make those more distinguishable.

Robert Miller asked if categories/classifications are supposed to be what we are planning for. For example, SR 85 is planned to be more than a major regional (MR) category. Phil Demosthenes said they are looking at what it will be.

A discussion then followed regarding access rights issues. Phil Demosthenes commented that granting permits for access control would fall into data procedures, not within these guidelines. Bob Hazlett stated that SR 303L is showing as an MR category and it is going to be a freeway (FW), and SR 85 should also be shown as FW. He added that it should reflect what is being consistent with the regional transportation plan (RTP). Property owners might think they can get a driveway. Phil Demosthenes noted that one distinguisher is that you cannot get a driveway on a MR category roadway. Rick Ensdorff mentioned that for those classifications that are falling into the proposed MR category now but are slated to become freeways, later, we will work out a right way to designate these roads. It's a logistical thing that access can be managed. Dale Buskirk suggested that since we're aware of the issues and there are several ways it can be handled, there should be time set aside at the next TAC meeting to discuss this issue. In the interim, Rick Ensdorff suggested coordinating with the district engineers to have that discussion. Dale Buskirk noted that this is an issue of great importance, should be further consulted with, and will still need to come back to the TAC meeting for discussion as an agenda item, to which Rick Ensdorff and the other attendees agreed.

Grant Buma asked if this will also be a transit/public use planning too. Rick Ensdorff responded that we will come to that later in the presentation.

Vince Li commented that US 60 to Florence Junction's possible realignment has future right-of-way that needs to be factored in. Rick Ensdorff pointed out that SR 191 is another example where district classification recommendations had discrepancies on intent. Another one was the Carefree Highway in which Phoenix District recommending an RA classification and Prescott District recommending an MR classification. A discussion followed regarding a few other routes. Rick Ensdorff clarified that we will cross-reference with lists and the district engineers. Grant Buma commented that SR 95 from Lake Havasu City to Bullhead City has a similar situation. Rick Ensdorff noted that there are some different situations such as that one that they will work with the districts and locals to bring back to the next TAC meeting.

Rick Ensdorff initiated a discussion on the Freeways (FW) category map. Phil Demosthenes stated there are 1,300 miles of freeway and 840 miles of MR proposed category roadways. Reza Karimvand asked about SR 90, if this has been finalized and added that he thought the MR section of it was longer. Rick Ensdorff responded that they will bring it back to the districts and then bring in the local agencies. Bob Hazlett asked if there are ways and a plan to delineate MR categories that are planned in the future. Dale Buskirk mentioned that it will be an important issue to discuss what to do with those. Rick Ensdorff stated that they will work on building this into this process.

Reza Karimvand brought up a question and a discussion followed about the turnback program. Rick responded that it doesn't change where this is going. That is an ADOT policy issue and this is an ADOT plan and regulation issue. In the RA classification, for example, there have been a little over 3,000 miles added to make other important roadways connected. Phil Demosthenes added that these roads serve as system "work horses".

Grant Buma asked if there are any plans to resurrect reservation roads into the system. Dale Buskirk responded that they are only looking at ADOT roads and that the State Classification Map isn't appropriate for these.

Rick Ensдорff stated that the team will work on graphics and inset maps in the AM Manual that will enable a user to zero in on select urban areas, providing a general reference guide for them. Dale Buskirk asked if the current draft maps cover current roads that are under construction or if the design is complete, but the roads are not open yet. Bob Hazlett used SR 202/South Mountain as an example. Dale Buskirk stated that we are a rapidly growing system and as the system is changing, the rule needs to be written to take these realities into consideration. Bryan Perry noted that if they are not existing yet, right of way cannot be purchased. Phil Demosthenes responded that it would still get automatically designated in the text and that the AM text is robust. It includes lessons they've learned in the past will be incorporated into this. Don Freeman asked how we de-mark routes as they change categories? Do they use milepost designation? Rick Ensдорff noted that the change point needs to be exact. That was a good question and he will address that in a minute. Referring back to the presentation Arizona State Highway (Draft) Access Management Categories slide, Phil Demosthenes gave an example of what is below the table's centerline at "A" level. The classification category of UC represents six miles in the State. The classification category of UB represents 150 miles. That's the bottom end. UC is hard to find on a map.

Rick Ensдорff presented the sample Assignment Listing slide, stating this as a working document/sample that illustrates the detail level of specific segment designations. This becomes very exact and this document would be in the manual. Dale Buskirk commented that some have very precise/small areas and asked if this was beneficial. Is this accurate enough in your experience? Phil Demosthenes answered yes, within five feet is good and he wouldn't want to go to 50 feet. The map is the general guide and the detailed spreadsheet is where to go to for specifics. Rick Ensдорff noted that this will be available to distribute for one last check. Phil Demosthenes pointed out that the category text is slightly different in the newer edition because of some discussions held with the districts.

Bryan Perry asked about looking at the wording and definitions of the text, using publishing the rule of "no full control of access" for the category. We need to be very careful on how we word this. For this to be useful, we need to also be sure we can protect access rights.

Ken Davis brought up the issue of closing of access where there is rapid growth in an area and the need for higher facilities to meet this need. Phil Demosthenes responded that we need to be ahead of the owners in planning to meet these facilities' changing needs. At some point, ADOT has to stand up and offer some other alternative. This will help organize your thoughts and provide for future planning. Rick Ensдорff repeated that this will go back to the districts where we will further refine it over the next two months with the district engineers and local agencies.

Don Freeman asked what is the legal relationship with us and the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), because they also have access rights. Rick Ensдорff responded that the ASLD develops land through agencies, that property gets developed within their local land use process.

Don Freeman responded that he has received feedback of conflicts in planning ("taking", used as an example) between ASLD and municipalities. Rick Ensдорff noted that this process will be partnership-driven. Don Freeman stated that he believes that this has not been occurring, especially in relation to out of state interests and influences. Phil Demosthenes said that once ADOT adopts AM in the rules/administrative code, all agencies, including ASLD and locals, will have to comply with the standards. Hopefully, this will develop partnerships and not conflict. Each agency's legal counsel will know this.

Vince Li asked if we are going to address the process of changing classifications. Rick Ensdorff replied yes, as well as the process for making a change. Vince Li asked if we do not have leverage for AM, then what happens? Rick Ensdorff explained that there will be a solid built program with a process there to deal with it. There still will be political influence, but they will have to follow a process based on very clear rules and standards. If ADOT consents to change, how does this work? What process will there be to change it- a board action rule? Phil Demosthenes stated that the State Transportation Board would need to process a rule change. We're having these meetings so that we do a good job at the first cut and there will be few changes. Rick Ensdorff added that this allows for more of a partnership agency change than a conflict/adversary one.

Phil Demosthenes presented the Access Design Elements slide and gave a little background. He noted that the research material sent out to the design team is from several states and Vergil Stover.

Dale Buskirk mentioned that ADOT has to be absolutely solid and that the design standards will be scrutinized by the district engineers. The districts have to enforce this so they should be on that team also. Daniel Williams suggested that the district level design staff be present, not just regional. Reza Karimvand stated that we also have roadway design and project management. Daniel Williams noted that at least one maintenance engineer needs to be involved from each district.

Bob Miller summarized how they came up with the AM Design Guidelines Review (DGR) Team members and also noted the need for engineering adequacy of the document. Rick Ensdorff pointed out that the selective design team's consideration will be going back to each district. Sam Elters explained that we ought to start with three areas of biggest impact (statewide, state traffic engineering, and roadway design) and come up with a knowledgeable plan that could be reviewed by all critical members of the department, then take it back to districts and other impacted areas. Finally, we would assemble and send it out for review.

Phil Demosthenes then moved back to the Access Design Elements slide. These are important basic elements looking for statewide consistency. Don Freeman noted that tables are easier to understand, such as in the Power Point presentation regarding the rules. Phil Demosthenes responded that narrative is enforceable and defensible (i.e. in court, if needed) and that tables do not provide the level of detail that narrative does. You do not want to design by tables as some things can be missed when looking at tables.

Phil Demosthenes then moved on to the Other Access Design Issues slide. Dan Williams inquired if access management is going to address bus pull-outs for mass transit. Phil Demosthenes responded that he didn't see that as a regulatory structure. If it's not crossing the right of way, it would be at the discretion of the engineer. Reza Karimvand recommended a section addressing "no passing zones" (NPZs) in the AM Manual, which would address proper turn lanes for developments. Phil Demosthenes replied that he could see that coming into the text. He noted that CDOT hasn't needed or had it, but if it fits the regulatory structure and helps to bring it into Arizona's AM Manual, we can address that.

John Harper asked if requests relating to emergency access will be addressed within the AM manual. Phil Demosthenes said yes, it will be addressed. It creates a mechanism. Is it needed or is it just wanted for a backdoor? Do they really qualify? This puts that question in as part of the process.

The Framework slides were discussed next. Phil Demosthenes briefly described each chapter. He then talked about the Internal Framework slide and suggested to really think about how your staff (locally to headquarters) interact, the roles, delegation, authorities and how this relates to permit coordination.

Rick Ensdorff discussed the Indian Community Outreach slide. After a meeting with Intertribal Council (ITC), last year, the ITC recommended that the team work with each of the 23 communities individually rather than them. This changed our outreach approach. A letter went out to every tribe. Arnold Burnham has been to 10-15 communities. Rick Ensdorff stated that we'd like to get a couple of tribes to work with, for example, the Navajo Nation and Salt River tribes.

Rick Ensdorff proceeded to the Next Steps slide. Tying the access management program to land use will be emphasized in these next steps. We will also continue other outreach efforts, potentially with developers. Dale Buskirk mentioned that because of the Governor's Growth Initiative, we have not yet initiated outreach of growth to developers. Dan Williams asked if outreach has occurred with the locals. Rick Ensdorff answered primarily through district workshops and multiple regional councils. These next steps will include "hands-on" workshops to further refine categories and classification assignments with locals. It was asked if outreach has extended to elected officials. Rick Ensdorff responded that many have been through regional councils and coordination with CCP but not all, but they plan to keep the cycle going. The next TAC meeting we want to have substantive milestones met, including outreach.

Rick Ensdorff concluded by noting that the next TAC meeting will tentatively be in the third week of April, after the ACEC Roads and Streets Conference. He expressed appreciation for everyone's attendance, participation, and feedback.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.